

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-5, 7-29, and 31-36 are pending, of which claims 1, 20, 26, 29, and 33-36 have been amended. Applicant's amendments and remarks after Final are appropriate under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because they address the Office's remarks in the Final Action, and thus could not have been presented earlier. In addition, the amendments and remarks should be entered to place the case in better form for appeal.

The amendments to claims 1, 20, 26, 29, and 33-36 are simply to clarify that a live television broadcast is displayed via a primary display screen through a Web browser program which is not taught or suggested by any of the references of record. The claim amendments are supported in the Specification at least on page 3, line 1, and throughout the description of Figs. 7-8 at page 11, line 2 through page 16, line 22 (*see* for example page 12, line 20).

**35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections**

**A.** Claims 1-5, 7-29, and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 5,398,074 to Duffield et al. (hereinafter, "Duffield") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0066085 A1 to Boyer et al. (hereinafter, "Boyer") (*Office Action* p.3). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**B.** Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Boyer in view of Duffield (*Office Action* p.9). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

1        Claim 1 recites a method of displaying recently accessed television  
2 channels comprising “displaying a live television broadcast via the primary  
3 display screen through a web browser program.” Duffield and/or Boyer do not  
4 teach or suggest displaying a live television broadcast via the primary display  
5 screen through a Web browser program, as recited in claim 1.

6        The Office recognizes that Duffield does not disclose displaying video  
7 through a Web browser program (*Office Action* p.4). Duffield only describes a  
8 television for multiple picture display of television channels. There is no  
9 indication of a Web browser program in Duffield, nor is there even a suggestion of  
10 a computing device or system that would possibly support the implementation of a  
11 Web browser program in Duffield.

12        Boyer is directed only to television program guide data and related  
13 multimedia information – not displaying a live television broadcast through a Web  
14 browser program, as recited in claim 1. Boyer simply describes that television  
15 program guide data and related multimedia information are provided in the form  
16 of Web pages in an HTTP format to a user with a personal computer (*Boyer*  
17 ¶¶0013, ¶¶0068, and ¶¶0072). Further, the television program guide may be accessed  
18 using a standard Web browser (*Boyer* ¶¶0073). There is no indication in Boyer of  
19 displaying a live television broadcast through a Web browser program, as recited  
20 in claim 1.

21        Boyer also describes that a program information page (i.e., a Web page)  
22 may include a selectable option for allowing the user to view a video clip of a  
23 selected program, and that a Web browser supports viewing video clips (*Boyer*  
24 Abstract and ¶¶0073). However, a video clip is a data file as described by Boyer in  
25

1 ¶0073, and not a live television broadcast displayed through a Web browser  
2 program, as recited in claim 1.

3 The television program information described in Boyer, including the video  
4 clips and full motion video, are contained in a media library of a computer system  
5 as media files (*Boyer* ¶15, ¶¶ 0065-66, and ¶0073). The video described in Boyer  
6 does not disclose or suggest a live television broadcast, as recited in claim 1.  
7 Boyer only describes that televisions 108, 112, and 120 shown in Fig. 3 all receive  
8 a television signal 110, 114, and 118, respectively (*Boyer*, ¶¶ 0069-71). There is  
9 no discussion or indication that any of these television signals are displayed  
10 through a Web browser program, as Applicant claims.

11 The Office also cites to ¶¶ 0130-134 of Boyer for presenting a [pay] per  
12 view event when the user selects and orders it from a pay-per-view channel (*Office*  
13 *Action* p.4). Applicant disagrees that this is a basis to reject displaying a live  
14 television broadcast via the primary display screen through a Web browser  
15 program, as recited in claim 1. Boyer only states that a when a user clicks on a  
16 pay-per-view entry in program listings, the user is taken to an order page which  
17 contains instructions on how to order a pay-per-view event (*Boyer* ¶¶ 0130-131).  
18 From there, the selected pay-per-view event may be delivered to the user's  
19 multimedia system, such as a set-top box, where a video unit decodes a television  
20 signal to display the ordered event (*Boyer* ¶¶ 0131-134). There is no teaching or  
21 indication that Boyer displays a live television broadcast through a Web browser  
22 program, as Applicant claims.

23 Accordingly, claim 1 along with dependent claims 2-5 and 7-19 are  
24 allowable over the Duffield-Boyer combination and Applicant respectfully  
25 requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

1        Claims 20, 26, and 33-35 recite a similar feature of displaying a live  
2 television broadcast via the primary display screen through a web browser  
3 program. For at least the reasons described above in the response to the rejection  
4 of claim 1, claims 20, 26, and 33-35 are allowable over the Duffield-Boyer  
5 combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be  
6 withdrawn.

7        In addition, claims 21-25 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon  
8 claim 20 (either directly or indirectly), and claims 27-28 are allowable by virtue of  
9 their dependency upon claim 26.

10  
11        Claim 29 recites that the primary display screen comprises a live television  
12 broadcast displayed through an interactive display environment including World  
13 Wide Web content. Duffield and/or Boyer do not teach or suggest a live television  
14 broadcast displayed through an interactive display environment including World  
15 Wide Web content, as recited in claim 29. Further, for at least the reasons  
16 described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, claim 29 along with  
17 dependent claims 31-32 are allowable over the Duffield-Boyer combination and  
18 Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

19  
20        Claim 36 recites the primary display screen capable of displaying a live  
21 television broadcast through a web browser program. For at least the reasons  
22 described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, claim 36 is allowable  
23 over the Duffield-Boyer combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the  
24 §103 rejection be withdrawn.  
25

**Conclusion**

Pending claims 1-5, 7-29, and 31-36 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Oct. 19, 2005

By: 

David A. Morasch  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Reg. No. 42,905  
(509) 324-9256 x 210